

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/752,534

Applicant(s)

KHARE ET AL.

Examiner

Hetul Patel

Art Unit

2186

## All Participants:

(1) Hetul Patel.

(2) Libby H. Hope (Reg. No. 46,774).

Status of Application: Application Pending

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 3 August 2004

Time: 1:40 PM

## Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1, 32 and 38

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

## Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: During the phone conversation, Attorney, Libby Hope, suggested to remove the following lines from independent claims 1, 32 and 38:

" determining that a responding node of the plurality of caching nodes has exclusive ownership of the contents". .